

## COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXVI. No. 15.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 8, 1814. [Price 1s.

449]

### SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

**AMERICAN WAR.**—The expedition against the *City of Washington*, or, rather, the result of it, has produced, in this country, the effect which might naturally have been expected.—“The Yankees are done for! Their *Metropolis* has been taken! They ran away at the sight of our troops! Mr. Madison and his Government have decamped! The States are left without Rulers! The ‘ill-organized association,’ says the *Times* newspaper, ‘is on the eve of dissolution;’ and the world is speedily to be delivered of ‘the mischievous example of the existence of a Government founded on democratic rebellion.’”—Thus says the *Times*, and thus say a vast majority of this taxed nation.—This was to be expected. The name of *Metropolis* was enough. The people here were sure to look upon it as the *London* of America; and, of course, to conclude, that America was subdued, or very nearly subdued. This is, too, the notion held forth by the newspapers; and, in fact, it universally prevails.—Now, the truth is, that the *City of Washington* is no city at all except in name. It was *begun to be built* only about sixteen years ago. The Congress has not met at it above ten or twelve years. It was built by a sort of *Lottery*, the shares of which fell, at one time, to less than 10 per cent. of their cost. The *Lottery* was drawn; the prizes were not paid. I do not, indeed, know what may have been done since I left the country; but, at that time, it was the general opinion, that it never would be a place of any consideration, though the law compelled the Congress to meet there. “Wherever the King is, there is the Court;” but, the Republican Government of America, though they may have had the puerile pride of erecting a *Capitol* and a *President’s Palace*, could not make a city, which implies a numerous population and great wealth.—But our officers, naval as well as military, appear to have perceived what would hit the taste of war-loving Johnny Bull. Johnny, who has no doubt of his

[450

having conquered France, would, of course, be delighted at the prospect of conquering America, towards which he would necessarily look on the capture of Washington as an almost last step; and, indeed, I heard some people, usually very sensible, say, upon the receipt of the news, “Thank God, we shall now have peace, and have ‘the income tax taken off.’”—What, in the eye of common sense, is the event, of which we have made such a boasting? We have, with an enormously superior naval force, ascended a very capacious bay in America, to the distance of about sixty miles. We have landed an army; we have repulsed the militia of superior numbers (as we say); we have entered a straggling town of wooden buildings, which our own newspapers had told us the Americans themselves had acknowledged to be defenceless; we have set fire to several buildings and some ships; we have (thank God) burnt the *President’s Palace*, and a building on a ridiculously grand scale, called the *Capitol*, where the Legislature of the Union held its sittings; we have then retreated, and regained our ships with such haste, that we have been compelled to leave our dead, and many of our wounded, officers as well as men, to the mercy of an enemy, whom our newspapers call unprincipled, cowardly, and cruel.—This is what the *Morning Chronicle* calls one of the most “gallant dashes” of the war. This is styled success. This is a victory to boast of. This is to induce the Americans to go down upon their knees, and solicit peace on any terms!—Why did our army not remain at Washington? When the French got to Berlin, Vienna, Naples, Hanover, Madrid, Amsterdam, they remained in them as long as they pleased. When they got to Moscow even, they remained for some weeks. But we, we capture the *Metropolis* of America, and we decamp instantly. We set off in such haste, that we leave behind us many of those who have been wounded in the enterprise. Oh! reader! how has Napoleon been abused for leaving behind him his sick and wounded, when he retreated from Russia! And yet



we can extol the bravery and wisdom of those who, in our own service, do the same thing!—Far am I, however, from blaming Mr. Ross for leaving his wounded behind him; for, in the first place, he was sure that he left them in the hands of a very humane people; and, in the next place, by delaying his departure, he might have added a very long list to his killed and wounded. But, it is impossible to find out any apology for Mr. Ross, upon this occasion, without furnishing an apology for the so-much reprobated conduct of Napoleon. Mr. Ross assigns the best possible reason for his wonderfully expeditious retreat to the ships; namely, he was afraid, that if he delayed this movement, the militia might collect in such numbers as to intercept him.—The militia! What that same sort of troops, whom he had just overthrown as it were by merely shewing his red coats? How were they to collect in such haste? Whence were they so speedily to come?—Thank you Mr. Ross, for this acknowledgment, though, perhaps, made involuntarily; because it proves clearly, that you were fully convinced, that you were got amongst a people, on whose cowardice and whose want of patriotism, you could place not a moment's reliance; because it clearly proves, in short, that, if we succeed in this war, we have a people, an armed people, to subdue. There is one fact, stated in the report of the enterprise, to which our newswriters pay no attention; but which is of very great importance. After the American troops had gone off, and left ours to enter the city, Gen. Ross, our commander, had his horse shot under him, as he was going along at the head of his men, by a gun fired from the window of a private house. There can be no doubt that the ball was intended for the rider. This might have given him, and, I dare say, did give him, a tolerably lively idea of what sort of people he was got amongst; and it ought to convince wise Johnny Bull, that to follow the advice of the *Times* newspaper, and send a large force into the heart of the country, there to take up a "commanding position," is much easier upon paper than it is upon land.—The *Times* and *Courier* are nettled that our commanders did not date their dispatches from the Capitol. I dare say, that they had no disinclination that way; but, then, the militia might have collected! In short, they had not time to do it with

safety. That was the reason why they did not do it; and, for my part, I think the reason quite satisfactory.—The episode to the "brilliant dash," seems to have been marked with nearly all the characteristics of the "brilliant dash" itself.—Sir Peter Parker, with his ship's company and marines, go in search of a parcel of militia in a wood. The reader may not, perhaps, be aware, that there is no sort of resemblance between the American and the English militia. These militia in America receive no pay, no clothing, no arms, from the Government. Every man goes out in his own ordinary array, and carries his own arms and accoutrements. Ninety-nine times out of a hundred he finds his own powder and ball. In short, it was a body of the people, voluntarily assembled, and acknowledging no superior not of their own electing: this was the sort of force against whom Sir Peter Parker marched.—They were, as usual, greatly superior in numbers; and, as usual, they were defeated, and ran away. But, in the end, Sir Peter Parker lost his life, and his second in command succeeded . . . . . in what? Why, in bringing off to the ship almost all our wounded!—As to the destruction of the public buildings at the city of Washington, it will give great pleasure to all those who really love Republican Government. There are palaces enough elsewhere. America wants none; and, it will, I dare say, be very long before she will see another. There are very good buildings in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and many other elegant and populous cities. There wants no grandeur; there wants no capitol, no palace, no metropolis, no court. All these bring taxes and standing armies; and the Americans want neither.—There was, the other day, an article, in the *Times* newspaper, which struck me as a remarkable instance of the force of habit, and as a clear proof, that a man may accustom himself to slavish ideas, till he, in good earnest, regards as a reproach every mark of freedom.—The article, to which I allude, was a commentary on a paper, published by the person to whom the defence of New York is committed, and who, in a very pressing manner, invites, exhorts, requests, and beseeches persons, capable of bearing arms, to come forth and augment his force, &c. &c.—Upon this, the Editor of the *Times* observes, that this Officer cuts a most sorry and lamentable figure; and he jests most



merrily  
"who,"  
"beseech"  
—W  
people le  
a comm  
their s  
their cha  
will not  
in any  
to be co  
should w  
count?—  
seem ast  
have bee  
prepared  
mean by  
twenty h  
be suffici  
few men  
coast (in  
of three  
Such ad  
gives an  
navy as  
extent o  
millions  
fence of  
country,  
the bomb  
ing of a c  
It means  
from bein  
as to mal  
defence,  
people th  
raise no  
not give  
know ver  
army, the  
knocked  
this to th  
the hand  
We, inde  
We hav  
Generals,  
Captains,  
missaries,  
have mili  
and so o  
sides, gr  
some of  
England i  
We have  
soldiers i  
We like  
we VER  
all these  
purchase



merrily upon the *tone* of the poor gentleman, "who," says he, "*invites, exhorts, requests, beseeches*: anything but **COMMANDS**" —Well! and what of that? Are the people less happy, because no one assumes a *commanding tone* towards them? Is their situation less enviable for that? Is their character less dignified, because they will not suffer themselves to be *commanded* in any way whatever? They do not like to be *commanded* by any body; and why should we quarrel with them on that account? —This Editor, and many others, seem astonished, that Mr. Madison should have been two years at war, without being prepared for *defence*. But, what do they mean by *defence*? Three hundred; nay, twenty hundred thousand men, would not be sufficient to guard every point, where a few men can be landed for a few hours, on a coast (including bays and mouths of rivers) of *three or four thousand miles in extent*. Such adventures as Admiral Cochrane gives an account of, might, with such a navy as ours, be performed, on such an extent of coast, in spite of two or three millions of regular soldiers. —The *defence* of America, and, indeed, of any country, does not mean the preventing of the bombardment of a village, or the burning of a city, or the carrying off of "*stock*." It means, the preventing of that country from being subdued, or, so much humbled as to make a disgraceful peace. And this defence, in America, must be *left to the people themselves*. Mr. Madison could raise no regular armies. The people do not give him the means to do it. They know very well, that for want of a regular army, they are liable to have some towns knocked down, or sacked; but they prefer this to the putting of a standing army into the hands of any man in their country. We, indeed, are of a taste widely different. We have Field-M Marshals, hundreds of Generals, and Colonels, and Majors, and Captains, and Barrack-masters, and Commissaries, and Cadets, and so on. We have military depôts, academies, colleges, and so on to a long list. We have, besides, great numbers of foreign officers, some of whom have had *commands* in England itself, and of counties of England. We have also greater numbers of foreign soldiers in our pay. This is our taste. We like to have these people. But, then, we **VERY CHEARFULLY PAY** for all these fine things. We are willing to *purchase* our safety in this way. Now, as

I never heard that the Americans quarrelled with us on this account, why should we quarrel with them for their *taste*? They prefer a few towns sacked or beaten down, now and then, to the paying for a standing army, for barracks, depôts, and military colleges. Their taste may be bad. They may prove themselves very stupid in not liking to see their streets crowded with beautiful, tall, straight gentlemen, with pretty hats and caps, with furs and whiskers, with cloaks, and glittering swords and boots, that shine like japan mugs. — But, *stupidity* is no *crime*; and, if they do not like these things, we, who have so much more refinement amongst us, and so much more elevation of mind, should view them with pity, rather than with scorn; should speak of them with compassion, rather than with reproach. We might as reasonably reproach them (and the French too, by the bye) for not having a taste for *tythes*. We like these too. — Mr. Burke said so, many years ago. We like to give our clergy a tenth part of our crops. But, then, have we not our churches and cathedrals, our prayers and our sermons, our bells and our singing, our lord's supper, our baptism, confirmation, churching of women, absolution of the sick, and burial of the dead. We have all these things, and a great many more, in return for the tenth of our crops; and the Americans (poor fellows!) have none of them. Yet, we ought not to *reproach* them on this account. It is, doubtless, bad taste in them; but, as I said before, bad taste is not *criminal*. — Another thing I wish to point out to the attention of the reader. — He frequently sees, in our newspapers, *extracts from American papers*, all tending to degrade the Government and decry its measures. — Out of the three or four hundred newspapers, published in America, there are probably ten or twelve who proceed in this tone. These are carefully sent hither by Consuls, or other persons residing there. From these only extracts are published *here*; and, be it observed, that, if we possessed the papers on the other side of the question, we should be *exposed to utter ruin*, if we were to publish such extracts from them, as it would be necessary to publish, in order to give the public a fair view of the state of men's minds in America. — But, the hireling prints here do one thing for us: they, by their extracts, prove to us *how great is freedom in America*. The *Times* tells us, that one paper



in America expresses its opinion, that the President himself had a narrow escape from Washington; and, that another *expresses its regret that he was not taken by the enemy*. Now, reader, imagine, for a moment, the case of an enemy landed in England, and some writer expressing *his regret, that the said enemy had not captured the king!*—You tremble for the unfortunate creature. I see you tremble. Your teeth chatter in your head. I hear them chatter; and well they may. How many *loyal* men do I hear exclaim: “send the traitor to the gallows! rip out his bowels and throw them in his face! Cut off his head! Quarter his vile carcass, and put the quarters at the king’s disposal!”—Yet, we hear the American writers wishing that their chief magistrate had been taken by the enemy; and, we do not find that any thing is either done or said to them. Their publications are suffered to take their free course. If they be true, and speak sense and reason, they will gain adherents, as they ought. If false, or foolish, they will only gain for the writers hatred or contempt, which, I dare say, has been the case in the instance before us.—But, reader, let us not, with this fact full in our eyes, be induced to believe that the Americans have nothing to fight for; or, that any man who loves freedom, can wish to see a change in the Government; or, at least, in the *sort* of Government which exists in that country.—As to Mr. Madison, against whom our hired men rail so much, *he* cannot be much to blame for *any* thing relating to the war. It was the *Congress*; the representatives of the people; the *real*, not the *sham*, representatives of the people who *declared war*. In fact, it was the people themselves, who were resolved no longer to endure that, which they had so long and so loudly complained of.—A war in America *must* be the *people’s* war. The defence of the country *must* be left to the people. Not only as to the fighting, but as to the time, place, and every thing else belonging to the war.—The people know very well the extent of their danger. They are well apprised of every thing. They were aware before-hand, that what has taken place would take place; and though many individuals must and will suffer, that will excite no general discontent against the Government.—Of one thing I am very certain; and that is, that we are carrying

on precisely that sort of warfare, which all the real friends of Republican Government would wish to see us carry on. It is a sort of warfare (especially when the ground of the war is considered), which cannot fail to *unite* the parties, into which the people have been divided; nor do I think it at all improbable, that we may cause Mr. Madison to be President four years longer than he would have been without our war against his country, and our threat to *depose* him. For many men will naturally say, that, though they would have liked to see him, following the example of Washington and Jefferson, decline a third term as President; yet, seeing that his so doing might be interpreted as a mark of submission to us, he ought again to be elected.—The favourite idea in England appears to be, that we ought to send out a great *overwhelming* force, get possession of some place in the heart of the country, and there compel the Government to surrender up the Republic on our own terms.—I suppose, that our commanders knew better than to *attempt* any thing of the kind. I suppose, that our Government knew better than to order them, or authorise them, to make any such attempt. And yet, what are we to do by such a mode of warfare as we are now carrying on?—Suppose we were to get possession of New York and some other maritime towns; what should we gain but an enormous expence to keep those places? Cooped up in them, how ridiculous should we look! No: we shall never beat that people, unless the *people themselves join us*; and, as this has not been the case yet, in any one instance, what reason have we to expect, but that it never will be the case, in spite of all the allurements held out to that people in the prospect of participating in the support of the army, the navy, the church, the law, the nobility, and the financial system of the former “*Mother Country*”?—But, we must not, in this larger view of the American War, overlook particular events, and especially, that just announced to us from *Fort Erie*.—In my last, I noticed the bloody battle of *Chippawa*. After that battle, it appears that the contest was renewed (*our* army having been *reinforced*) in the front of *Fort Erie*, into which the Yankees had retired, and where our gallant countrymen and their associates seemed to have been resolutely bent to fulfil our wishes, and to give them “a drub-

ing.”  
our ow  
to only  
compell  
leaving  
somers  
says, th  
point of  
the ang  
two hu  
might  
much a  
dict as  
passes  
sed, in  
any th  
ought  
this ar  
of the  
them v  
be had  
then, a  
Yanke  
is no s  
the pr  
come  
sort of  
discip  
dence  
coast  
our sh  
of *Er*  
of the  
must  
write  
ject.  
would  
acted  
on re  
repro  
repen  
concl  
now  
“cas  
“our  
“mu  
“W  
“ye  
“co  
“O  
“wh  
“at  
“ce  
“mi  
“be  
“lo  
“w  
“th  
“to



ing." Alas! the "drubbing" fell upon our own gallant army, who amounted to only about 2,000 men, and who were compelled to retreat, with all possible speed, leaving 905 either dead, wounded, or prisoners!—The American General, GAINES, says, that he destroyed our people *at the point of the bayonet*. Our General says, that the angle of a bastion was blown up with two hundred of our men on it. This last might be, and yet the case would not be much altered in our favour. Such a conflict as this I never before read of. It surpasses that of Chippawa; and that surpassed, in point of proportionate destruction, any thing in modern warfare.—And, it ought to be observed, that a great part of this army of Yankees were *militia*; some of them *volunteers*; and not a man of them who would suffer any one to say that he had him under his *command*!—It is, then, a fact beyond all dispute, that the Yankees will *sometimes* fight; and, as there is no such thing as ascertaining beforehand the precise time when the fighting fit will come on them, they being such an *irregular* sort of people, and subject to no kind of discipline, I think it is the height of prudence in our Commanders on the Atlantic coast not to venture too far at a time from our ships.—Upon hearing of *the battle of Erie* (for it cost as many men as several of the *battles of Wellington*), I was, I must confess, eager to hear what the *Times* writer would be able to say upon the subject. I had half a mind to hope, that he would begin to repent of the part he had acted, in the stirring up of this war; but, on reflection, I concluded, that, like the reprobates mentioned in the good book, repentance was not in his power. This conclusion was right, as the reader will now see.—"The *unfortunate event* which cast a partial shade over the successes of our Canadian army is at length communicated to us in an authentic shape. We extract, from the papers received yesterday from that part of the world, a copy of Sir George Prevost's General Order, dated Montréal, 25th of August; which states the loss sustained at the attack on Fort Erie, of the 13th preceding, at 902 killed, wounded, and missing. Compared with the whole number of General Drummond's force, this loss is no doubt very considerable: but we are glad to see no hint given, that the event is likely to occasion our troops to fall back. The misadventure must,

no doubt, be ranked among *those chances of war* to which the *bravest armies*, and *best laid plans*, are subject. It was preceded by a brilliant achievement, executed four days before by Captain Dobbs, of the Royal Navy, who, with a party of seamen and marines, most gallantly boarded and took two armed schooners, anchored close to Fort Erie. The consequence of this capture being to deprive the enemy's position of a great part of its defence, General Drummond resolved to follow it up by a general attack on Fort Erie and the American entrenchments. In this daring attempt he had *nearly* attained *complete success*. The spirit of our brave soldiers *surmounted every obstacle*. They had actually entered the fort, and had already turned part of its guns against the enemy's last point of refuge, when suddenly a tremendous explosion took place, which not only destroyed many valuable lives, but necessarily involved all our operations in confusion, and left no alternative but a precipitate retreat to our first approaches. It is *evident*, therefore, that General Gaines's boast of having repulsed our men at the *point of the bayonet*, is idle *gasconade*. The *lamentable result* was, in all probability, occasioned by *accident*; but if the American General had any share in it, it was one which reflected more credit on his *policy* than on his *bravery*. To spring a mine on an assailing enemy, may be in such circumstances an allowable mode of destruction; but whilst *humanity* is pained by contemplating such an event, there is no counter feeling of admiration for the *heroism* of those by whom the *dreadful deed* was executed."—Oh! you vile hypocrite! "*Humanity*" on your lips! on these same lips from which have proceeded so many urgent exhortations to exterminate Americans; and who, in this very same number of your sanguinary paper, *commends* Sir Thomas Hardy for having bombarded, and, as you then thought, burnt to ashes the dwellings of the people of the village of Stonington! *Humanity*!—This cant may do in a country where cant is so much in vogue; but, be you assured, that it will only excite contempt in the breast of the enemy.—You can discover "no heroism," can you, in the defenders of Fort Erie, who had lost their water-side defence before the battle began? The *three officers* of Colonel Scott's regiment,



who came out of the battle *alive* and *not wounded*, would, like Job's servants, tell you a different story; unless, indeed, like Bobadil, they were (which I am sure they would not do) to attribute their beating to the *planets*, instead of the American bayonets.—For my part, I believe General Gaines's in preference to General Drummond's report. Not because I question the veracity of the latter, but because I know that he *might* be misinformed, and that General Gaines *could not be* misinformed, as to the fact. But, as I said before, this fact of the blowing up of the angle of a bastion does not materially affect the merits of the case; and, unless the American people be very different in their natures from all other people, the event must have created a wonderful sensation in the country; and I am sure, that, in the eyes of any man in England, whose reason is not totally deadened by prejudice, it must have excited a dread, that, if we pursue that project of subjugation, so strongly recommended by the writers here, we are now embarked in a war of extraordinary bloodshed, of no ordinary duration, and of an expense that will keep on all our present taxes, and occasion constant annual loans.

SPAIN.—The abettors of corruption, who fattened so well while the war lasted with France, and who have so sincerely and so loudly deplored its termination, are making another effort to produce a partial war, at least, on the Continent. They have tried in vain to provoke France; they have failed in again embroiling Austria, Russia, and Prussia; and the war with America has been so unproductive, has given birth to so few contracts, and what have been entered into have been so unprofitable to the contractors, that they and the other satellites of corruption, who devour the produce of the labour of the country, without assisting in any shape to its increase; these men, finding the profits of their unprincipled traffic decreasing every day, are making a new effort to give a more advantageous turn to their own affairs, by involving us in a war with Spain; with that very people for whom we so very lately *professed* to sacrifice so many thousands of lives, and so many millions of money, merely to deliver them from a *foreign yoke*, and to restore them to *independence*.—We were extremely mad at Napoleon for leading, as we said, the *beloved Ferdinand*

into captivity; for relieving his *pious* and *virtuous* subjects from the tyranny of the priests; and for presuming to give them good laws against their will. All this we were quite indignant and enraged at; and although, as far as I have been able to discover, we were neither *called upon* by the royal family of Spain, nor by the people, to avenge their injuries; to chastise the French Emperor for his presumption; or to restore to the nation its *adored* chief, its *holy* tribunal, its saints, relics, miracles, and its fraternity of lazy monks, nuns, and voluptuous friars. Notwithstanding, I say, it does not appear that we were *solicited* by Spain, to revenge her cause, forth we went, fully armed for battle, to drive the troops of Napoleon beyond the Pyrennees, and to deliver the *sacred* territory from these impious and infidel hordes of Amalekites. And certainly we did drive them out, no matter by what means, placed Ferdinand again on his throne, enabled him to re-establish the Inquisition, and to restore the clergy to the plenitude of that power, which they had exercised, for so many centuries, to the glory of God, and to the benefit of—themselves.—By conferring these unsought for, these unparalleled, and extraordinary *blessings*, the promoters of these measures intended, as they said, that the people of Spain should have the full right to think and to act for themselves, in every thing that respected their laws, their Government, and their religion. We pretended, in short, that we had no other desire than to confirm to them the rights of nature, which give to no one a preference in these matters over another, unless in so far as his virtues and his talents command superior esteem. In return for these advantages, those engaged in conferring them might, and, perhaps, had a right, to calculate on the gratitude of a people for whom they had done so much. But *gratitude* is a word of so varied and so extensive a meaning, that it is not easy to say what view the instigators of the war in the Peninsula entertained of it. One thing, however, appears to be obvious: if it was expected of the Spaniards, in return for the pretended good we had done them, that they should relinquish any of their legitimate rights; that they should sacrifice any part of their trade or commerce; or that they should cease to enact such laws and regulations as they considered necessary to good Government. If any such expecta-



tions as these were entertained, they were most unreasonable, and what, it need not now surprize any one, could not fail, in the end, to be disappointed.—Independent of the circumstances of the interference on our part being entirely *voluntary*, which precluded all claim of *recompence*, every *restrictive* demand which we might think we had a right to make; nay, every regulation, though noway offensive in its nature, that we might urge the introduction of into Spain, must be viewed by the Spaniards as a species of that tyranny, exercised by Napoleon, which we professed it to be our sole object to destroy. But, however unreasonable and unjust such pretensions may appear, the supporters of corruption, resolved on a war, no matter with whom, nor what it may cost others, pretend to find a *cause* for this in a recent commercial regulation of the Spanish Court; a regulation dictated for the express purpose of *preserving* to a long established company “its beneficial monopoly, and to maintain unimpaired the national industry.”—This measure, the *Times* and the *Courier* writers have united in declaiming against, as a decided proof of Spanish *ingratitude*, of *malice*, of narrow petty *malignity* towards this country; for which, they say, that people ought to be severely punished; ought to be *compelled*, by our seamen and our soldiers, to recal the royal mandate, and to conform themselves to those commercial rules which we find beneficial, without regard to the injury they may do themselves; or, in the event of a refusal, to *oblige* the Spaniards to *repay* us all the money we have expended for them during the war.—Before I proceed to point out the inconsistencies of these servile writers, I shall here give the document, at length, which has given rise to their unprovoked and unjustifiable clamours:—

*Royal Mandate.*—His Excellency the Secretary of State and of Finances, this day communicated to me the subsequent Royal Order:—The Directors of the Royal Philippine Company have communicated with his Majesty, explaining to him that by his Royal Order of the 27th July last, forwarded by your Excellency, when you discharged the office of Minister of State for the Indies, it was commanded that the *exclusive privileges for commerce and merchandize, should be preserved inviolable to the said Company, and with the same just intention the*

*Royal Schedule of the 12th July, 1803* was confirmed. But this Declaration will be inefficacious and even *prejudicial, not only to the Company but to the national industry in general*, if such Asiatic and European commodities, as are prepared likewise in Spain and America are not prohibited, and if a *clandestine trade* be countenanced under the colour and pretext of such commodities. To preserve therefore to the Company its *beneficial monopoly, and to maintain unimpaired the national industry, which is engaged in the manufacture of cottons*, it becomes necessary to *renew the publication and annunciation of the said privileges, and to fix the term of four months for the disposal of this description of goods by the individuals possessing them; and after such term the holders shall sell them to the Company; but should the terms not be agreed upon between the proprietors and the Company, another month will be allowed for the exportation of the goods abroad, according to the arrangement particularized in Articles 57 and 58, in the said Royal Schedule, respecting cotton articles made prize of or otherwise.* The said Directors further set forth, that if the Company is to arrive at the rank, elevation, and splendour which the nation expected at its establishment; and if it is to repair its *immense losses* which it has most innocently incurred, it is absolutely indispensable that the indulgence sought be granted, especially at the present moment, *when two expeditions from Manilla and Calcutta are approaching the Peninsula, and the effects which they bring can obtain no sale if they are to meet a competition in the market from other commodities of the same class, and the ruin of the Company will be thus accomplished by the exertions they have applied in completing these expeditions.* His Majesty the King having duly considered these important subjects, and being persuaded of the just reasoning of the Directors regarding them, has been pleased to determine, that in punctual observance of the exclusive privilege of the Company, from the present time private merchants shall not be permitted to import either into Spain or America cotton manufactures, whether Asiatic or European, conceding, however, the term of four months for the disposal of such goods, after which interval, they are to be offered to



"the said Company, but if the conditions  
"should not be acceptable, another month  
"is to be granted for the exportation, as  
"in the case of prize goods, &c. These  
"particulars I communicate to your Ex-  
"cellency by his Majesty's order for your  
"information, and that you may impart  
"the same to the proper officers, that they  
"may in all respects pay obedience there-  
"to. God preserve you, &c.—GONGORA.  
"Palairo, Aug. 29.—To the Superin-  
"tendants of Revenue."

On the above regulation, the following remarks appeared in the *Times* of Wednesday:—"This Prince, who, in all justice  
"and equity, is indebted many millions  
"sterling to this country in money expend-  
"ed in replacing him on his throne; that  
"this very Prince is the first to set the  
"example of an absolute prohibition of our  
"cotton manufactures. For the honour of  
"human nature, we hope that the mer-  
"chants of Cadiz has received a false  
"alarm. We are unwilling to believe  
"that such *ingratitude* can exist among  
"men; but if it be true, we hope our Go-  
"vernment *will peremptorily demand pay-  
"ment of every farthing expended by us  
"in Spain, and will take effectual means  
"(for such we have in our power) to  
"ENFORCE the demand."*—In the  
*Courier* of the same day, these senti-  
ments were echoed in the following man-  
ner:—"The gratitude of nations for ser-  
"vices rendered them is not very prover-  
"bial, and the conduct of Spain furnishes  
"us unfortunately with too frequent occa-  
"sions to make this remark. That Spain  
"owes a debt of gratitude to this nation,  
"greater, perhaps, than any country ever  
"owed another, will not be denied. But  
"in her treatment she has made no differ-  
"ence between us her defenders, and  
"France her oppressor.—It is not merely  
"in a commercial point of view that we  
"deplore this measure—we deplore it  
"upon higher, upon moral grounds; be-  
"cause it seems to be a gratuitous malice,  
"a purposed proof of ingratitude for the  
"services we have rendered Spain. Had  
"she possessed cotton manufactures her-  
"self which she wished to encourage, and  
"therefore adopted this prohibitory decree,  
"we could not have blamed her; for it is  
"the duty of all nations to encourage and  
"protect their own manufactures. But  
"Spain has no cotton manufactures, no  
"establishment that can be injured by the  
"importation of our cottons. If such a

"decree has been issued, we perfectly  
"coincide with a Brother Journalist, in  
"hoping our Government will peremptorily  
"demand payment of every farthing ex-  
"pended by us in Spain, and will take  
"effectual means (for such we have in  
"our power) to ENFORCE the demand."—  
Now reader, having read the above man-  
date of Ferdinand, do you discover any  
thing in it to justify the abusive and threa-  
tening language of these vile journals?—  
It is not the establishment of a *new com-  
pany*, with rights prejudicial to our com-  
merce, that they complain of: nor is it  
conferring any privileges of that descrip-  
tion upon an old company, that it did not  
possess before, about which these hireling  
writers have raised so loud a cry. The  
Royal Philippine Company, like our East  
India Company, is an *ancient* establish-  
ment, and the mandate now issued by the  
King of Spain in favor of the former, can  
be considered in no other light than as a  
*renewal* of its charter, which, we know,  
has been often granted, and is again in  
contemplation of being granted by our own  
legislature, to the latter.--My own opinion  
is, that all monopolies ought to be abo-  
lished; that what is called regulating  
trade and commerce, is prejudicial to both.  
But I cannot permit it to be asserted, with-  
out entering my protest against the doc-  
trine, that, even supposing monopolies were  
founded in wisdom, any one nation, or Go-  
vernment, should be entitled to grasp at  
the whole, and threaten to punish all others  
who presumed to come in for a share of  
the general plunder. We, forsooth, are to  
be allowed, not only to exclude the great  
mass of our own population from a share of  
our East India trade, but also the inhabi-  
tants of most other States; and yet, when  
the Spanish Government shew a similar  
preference to a favourite body of men  
among themselves, we immediately open  
our batteries of abuse against them, and  
threaten to *punish* them if they follow our  
example. What are all our statutes passed  
to protect our colonial products, and our  
manufactures, but laws *prohibiting* the im-  
portation of foreign goods? and what do  
these prohibitions amount to, in reference  
to other nations, but a monopoly of trade  
with us?—We tax the silks and the wines  
of Spain, of Portugal, and of France.  
This is turning our monopolizing system to  
some account. But, if the duty which we  
impose makes the article so high in price,  
that few or none can afford to purchase it,



and are obliged to content themselves with an article made at home, though much inferior, the effect is the same upon the country which produces the superior article, as if our Government had granted an exclusive right to a particular company here to deal in that article. If we complain of the Court of Spain for confirming rights granted its own subjects, by which our cotton manufactures may be excluded the Peninsula, they have an equal right to complain of us for conferring exclusive privileges on the East India Company, and for enacting laws which have the effect of an absolute prohibition of the produce of the Spanish soil. The bill lately brought into Parliament for *protecting*, as it was called, the agricultural interests of this country, would evidently have been injurious to the growers of corn in France, in Spain, and in all other countries where crops are so abundant as to permit importation. What then would we have said, had these nations complained of us for adopting a measure which tended so manifestly to injure them? Why, we would have laughed at them. We would have treated their remonstrances with contempt. And have not the Spaniards the same right to laugh at us, who do not merely complain of their following our footsteps, but who actually *threaten* to go to war with them, and to *punish* them, because they enact what laws and regulations they consider best calculated to protect their own commerce and manufactures?—O! but says the *Courier*, “it is not merely in a commercial point of view that we deplore this measure—we deplore it upon higher, upon *moral* grounds; because it seems to be a gratuitous malice, a purposed proof of ingratitude for the services we have rendered Spain.”—As to the “services we have rendered Spain,” it appears somewhat strange, if these services were as great as we boast of, that their effects should have turned out so very *prejudicial*, that even those who formerly estimated them so highly, are now the loudest to complain of them; the foremost to deplore the *blindness* and *fatality* of a people, who could not, or would not, open their eyes, and be persuaded that we had nothing *selfish* in view; but that all we had done, all the sacrifices we had made, proceeded from the *purest* and most *disinterested* motives. Before, however, the monopoly complained of can be held an *immoral* act on the part of the Spaniards, it must be shewn, in the first place, that they

applied to us for assistance; and, secondly, when this is made clear, it must then be shewn, that they *promised* to *abolish* some of their ancient regulations prejudicial to our commerce, or to establish some new ones to encourage it, as a reward for the services we intended to perform for them. All this it is incumbent on us to shew before we can charge the Spanish Monarch with *ingratitude*, for enacting a regulation so conducive to the interests of his own people. If we have *lent* money to Spain, it is right she should pay it back when the stipulated term of payment arrives. But, to proclaim war against a whole nation, as the *Times* has done, because its Government has adopted a policy similar to ours, in order to protect its own institutions, is an act so outrageous, and so contrary to all decency, that language is not sufficient to stigmatise it as it ought. It can only be equalled by the canting and hypocritical pretensions of the *Courier* writer, who affects to *deplore* the measure of the Spanish Government, on account of its *immoral* tendency! As a proof of the *sincerity* of the professions of this stickler for morality, we find he has attempted, on this very subject, to impose a palpable *falsehood* on the public. He asserts that the Spaniards have *no* cotton manufactories; hence he infers, that the Royal mandate, prohibiting the importation of cotton, proceeded from malice, and a pre-determination to injure us, without any benefit resulting therefrom to themselves. It would be difficult to conceive how any people could act a part so wanton and atrocious; and bad as the Spanish Government appear to be, I could not persuade myself that it had gone so far in wickedness. This was the impression given to my mind, on reading the paragraph which I have cited above from the *Courier*. When I came to peruse the Spanish document, I was not only confirmed in that opinion, but I found it there stated, in direct opposition to the *Courier's* assertion, that the importation of foreign cotton goods into Spain was prohibited, in order to encourage and protect the established manufactories of cotton amongst the inhabitants, and also to insure a ready sale, at a fair price, for several fresh cargoes of goods of that description belonging to the Philippine Company, and then on their passage home to the mother country, but which, it was foreseen, would not turn out so pro-



ductive, if the market was stocked with the manufactures of other nations. If reasons like these are to be allowed no weight in the case of Spain, upon what ground is it that we, almost every Session of Parliament, are passing bills to protect and encourage our own manufactures, and to procure for them a preference over those of all other nations? We were lately told in the *Times*, that it would be the best policy in the people of France not to attempt, at present, to establish manufactories of their own, but to purchase from us, by which they would, in the course of time, be able to imitate our superior workmanship.—From articles that I have already seen of French manufacture, I see no reason why that people should take the advice that has been so officiously given them, although I can readily discover that the proposal originated in jealousy on the part of those who gave it. The same dread of another successful rival starting up in Spain, is evidently the true cause of the viperation that has appeared in our prostituted journals, against the Government of that country. This may serve to gratify the spleen and malice of those who never can be at ease, until they add the monopoly of every production of the earth, to that which they already arrogantly exercise over the seas. But, in spite of these malignant passions, what seems to be now viewed in a proper light, in many countries that were formerly inattentive to their true interests, must ultimately prevail. It is truly ridiculous to hear the enemies of general improvement talking of securing our monopoly by *violent* measures, and boasting of our possessing the means of *effectually furnishing* other nations, because they have at last had their eyes open to the wise policy of giving encouragement to their own artisans, and thereby rendering themselves completely independent of their neighbours. We may threaten, and swagger, as much as we please; but unless we are prepared to punish not only the people of Spain, but also of France, Italy, Germany, Russia, Sweden, and Denmark, where improvements in the arts are every day making rapid progress, it is idle to expect that we shall be able to keep up that commercial importance we have so long maintained, but which, in consequence of the prevalence of corruption, and the haughty manner in which we carry ourselves towards other nations, is fast verging to its dissolution. As to the means

we are said to possess of *humbling* the Spaniards, the less we pretend to on this score the better. A system that depends so much, as ours does, upon loans, and that lately found itself under the necessity of calling upon the East India Company for the trifling sum of one million two hundred thousand pounds, *in advance of duties*, for which a discount was given, can neither boast very high, nor very long, of its abilities to prosecute new wars. It will be time enough, at any rate, to think of punishing the Spaniards, when we have completed the drubbing which we have pledged ourselves to give to the Americans. —I had written thus far, when the Paris papers brought me the Report of the Committee, appointed by the French Government, to consider the petitions of the merchants and manufacturers, praying that a prohibition might be issued against the importation into France of English cotton goods. It is an interesting document, and as it bears me out in the facts and general reasoning which I have stated and adopted above, I shall here insert some of its most striking passages:—

“The merchants and manufacturers of several cities, alarmed at the vague, and no doubt, unfounded rumours of a treaty of commerce, allowing the importation of English cotton goods, have petitioned against a measure which would ruin their establishments, and endanger the existence of 250,000 workmen employed in them. —In the midst of the disorders of our Revolution, it is a noble spectacle to witness the progress of sciences, fine arts and manufacturing industry. In our manufactures are produced damasks, as fine as those of Syria; we have fire arms of all kinds, surpassing in elegance every thing which Europe can boast of, and executed with a rapidity inconceivable before our days; files, which polish the hardest English files; mathematical instruments as correct, and not so costly, as those which the London workmen boasted of; ornaments in bronze, unequalled for dignity of form and delicacy of execution; locksmith wares executed not only in Paris, but even in the departments, which, to an exquisite precision, unite the most wonderful combinations and magnificence; crystals, not inferior to flint glass; velvets which, from the curious combination of their threads, reproduce the colours, and even the expression of the most finished pictures; tanworks, where the discoveries of chemistry are

turned to  
reotyping  
enamelling  
glass has  
learned in  
Francis  
the first  
respect to  
and the  
long purc  
tians, and  
English  
thirty or  
and colo  
througho  
Revoluti  
amounted  
half of th  
own man  
ment to s  
made the  
Decrees  
July, 17  
tion of fo  
ment to  
Commer  
importat  
the prog  
Assembl  
ductive b  
ed freed  
customs  
such hig  
to a pro  
a wiser  
year 5,  
the prod  
this peri  
ning est  
our diff  
of mech  
when al  
contribu  
mulate  
13th Fr  
Feb. 18  
of the sa  
The cele  
Britann  
the Mil  
of absol  
manufac  
crease  
were y  
millions  
and w  
duced in  
of one  
least.



turned to account; we have invented stereotyping; we have perfected the art of enamelling in all its branches; painting on glass has been re-established more true and learned in its colours than in the times of Francis the 1st, and Henry the 2d. In the first rank, among these conquests with respect to utility, is the spinning of cotton and the weaving cotton cloths, which we long purchased from the Greeks and Venetians, and afterwards from the Portuguese, English and Swiss. During the last thirty or forty years, the taste for white and coloured cottons has diffused itself throughout all ranks. At the time of the Revolution, the consumption of France amounted to sixty millions. Scarcely the half of this amount was produced in our own manufactories, which gave employment to seventy thousand workmen. We made then hardly any white cottons. The Decrees of Council of the 10th and 17th July, 1785, which prohibited the introduction of foreign cottons, gave an encouragement to this manufacture.—The famous Commercial Treaty of 1786, permitted the importation of English cottons, and injured the progress of our own. The Constituent Assembly, too wise to be blinded by the seductive but impracticable idea of an unlimited freedom of commerce, by its tariff of customs of 13th March, 1791, established such high duties as to be almost equivalent to a prohibition. The Convention framed a wiser law in the year 2, confirmed in the year 5, prohibiting without exception all the productions of English industry. From this period we may date our principal spinning establishments, and the perfection of our different manufactories. The Museum of mechanical arts, a vast establishment, when all inventions were open to workmen, contributed powerfully to enlighten and stimulate our industry. The Decrees of the 13th Fructidor, year 9, that of the 22d Feb. 1806, and the law of the 30th April of the same year, renewed the prohibitions. The celebrated Berlin decree, declaring the Britannic Isles in a state of blockade, and the Milan decree, consolidated the system of absolute prohibition. The spinning and manufacture of cottons continued to increase till the buildings and machinery were valued at upwards of two hundred millions; and two hundred and fifty thousand workmen were employed, who produced in a year calicoes, &c. to the value of one hundred and seventy millions at least. This property was shut. One of

the most destructive acts of tyranny, in its consequences in all history, shook these establishments to their foundations, namely the Decree of the 5th August, 1810, by which the Government imposed a duty on the introduction of colonial goods, that surpassed three or four times their real value. Cottons did not escape this monstrous tax. The effects were what might have been expected. While preparations were making for the campaign in which our military power was annihilated, our commerce suffered immense losses. In consequence of the rise in the price of the raw materials, the equilibrium between the wants and the capitals was lost. The want of consumption lowered the price, credit only served to deepen the abyss; the manufacturer precipitated the merchant, and the merchant the banker, and even the humble artizans shared in the general failure. The Government, reduced to support manufactures at its own expence, avoided a total repeal by the Decree of the 18th Oct. 1810, which ordered the burning of all English manufactures; this atrocious act was necessary as a counterpoise to the excessive tax; and those manufacturers who stood the first shock by means of sacrifices, were still able to supply the wants of consumers. In 1813, notwithstanding the past losses, the continuing taste for cottons, and the rigour of the prohibition, still sustained our principal houses; but the failures began again to multiply, and the alarm became general. Such was the situation of our manufactures, when a succession of reverses brought the forces of all Europe into our territories. The first demand of the petitioners is connected with this great event. The warehouses of our merchants and manufacturers were then filled with cottons, which had paid a tax of four francs forty cents, six francs sixty cents, and eight francs eighty cents per kilogramme, according to the quality; and this duty amounted to forty millions, being about thirty millions for the present France. In these extraordinary circumstances, the act of the 23d April last, suppressing the whole of the duties, was passed, after which cottons fell one half in price. Many houses were overturned in consequence, and those which did not fail, have contracted engagements which they now find it difficult to fulfil. In this state of things, the merchants of Little Saint Quintin, Rouen, and Paris, implore the justice of the Chamber. I know it may be urged, that it was



impossible to avoid these losses, when our custom-houses were overturned, and England inundated our coasts not only with colonial goods, but also with her own manufactures. In a question so difficult, your Committee has charged me with submitting to you a few observations. The Chamber has already solemnly acknowledged the fundamental principle, that the first duty of Governments is to be just. If the wrong has originated in the free act of the Government, far from us the thought that such an act did not require reparation. But it is notorious, that on the 23d April, and long before, from Antwerp to Geneva, from Bayonne to the mouth of the Charente, at the heels of the four hundred thousand men who had invaded France, goods were introduced for the sake of deriving a profit from our defeats. In these circumstances, all that could be done was to diminish the sum of the evil. After a disastrous war, how many irreparable losses, and how many just demands, to which we can only answer in the language of consolation! An enlightened Government will indemnify us by its benefits, for the reverses to which we have been condemned by the errors of the former. And this brings me to the second demand of the petitioners.

"The petitioners desire a law which, for some years at least, shall prohibit absolutely the introduction of foreign cottons. The noble idea that a commerce without shackles, would be the most efficacious means of increasing human industry and happiness throughout the world, though it can hardly be disputed, has never yet been carried into practice by any nation. All wish to draw every thing to themselves, even those indigenous productions which nature has distributed unequally to different countries, as if to invite them to a friendly intercourse with each other; all would be sellers, and all purchase with regret. But regrets on this subject are useless. Every nation which does not wish to effect its own ruin, must now purchase only what cannot be manufactured at home, except at an exorbitant price, or except its industry can be differently employed to much greater advantage: and must facilitate the exchange of raw productions, but receive as few manufactures as possible in exchange for raw produce. When our manufactures come at home in competition with foreign manufactures, we must either impose a tax on

the foreign, equivalent to a prohibition, or pronounce an absolute prohibition. England has made an absolute prohibition one of the bases of its manufacturing policy.—We have never in any treaty obtained the introduction of our silks into its ports. What is its famous Navigation Act, but a prohibition against all goods not brought in its own ships, and even against foreign vessels attempting to trade to any of its coasts or settlements? What are at this time the wants and resources of our manufactures, and what is also the position of France? A capital of two hundred millions, two hundred and fifty thousand workmen, goods manufactured to the value of one hundred and sixty millions, which, after deducting thirty millions for raw materials, leave one hundred and thirty millions to be divided among all those concerned in the trade; on the other hand, the ruin of our manufactures and credit, and a general discouragement, these are the facts which must guide us in our determination. An experience of twenty years proves, that our manufactures are sufficient for our own consumption. We need not dread an excessive price; for the competition among our manufacturers would always prove a sufficient remedy. When we compare our situation with that of England, we have great advantages over the English manufacturer in the low price of workmanship; but in England the machinery, which is incessantly improving, supplies more and more the place of human labour; the workman is more experienced and skilful; in France, in many manufactures, the machinery requires to be improved, and the machine and the workman require to be more familiarised with each other. This is not all; the conscription has destroyed a generation skilled in this business, and we must instruct a new generation. Notwithstanding these obstacles, we manufacture common stuffs as well, and nearly as cheap, as the English, and begin to enter into competition with them in foreign markets. In the superior qualities the case is different; but the interval which separates us is inconsiderable, and in a few days will be passed. What do we now want? Encouragements and guarantees. I wish to persuade myself that England will be pleased to see our prosperity increase. May a solid peace unite two nations so deserving of the esteem of each other, for the sake of the happiness of the whole world! But our relations with

England  
stances.  
should s  
goods, w  
dies, oil  
Since a  
to her  
many m  
has your  
The form  
tion of  
vigour;  
blished,  
continue  
petitione  
commerce  
appeared  
cial trea  
three ye  
period v  
estimate  
nations.  
terrupti  
time nee  
merce w  
tion of a  
merely l  
taxation  
requires  
time the  
must de  
Perhaps  
mercant  
ciprocal  
could ju  
such pr  
terest  
whole,  
that the  
conside  
second  
cotton  
year 5,  
1806,  
bition,  
of opin  
matter  
tarif co

Mr.  
my last  
holders  
and for  
poor d  
the liv  
the pri  
but th  
mecha  
The ri



England must be determined by circumstances. Why, in our present situation, should she lade her vessels with cotton goods, which take back our wines, brandies, oils, soaps, cambrics, and laces?—Since all colonial commodities have fallen to her share, we have otherwise but too many means of exchange with her. What has your Committee to propose to you?—The former laws prohibiting the introduction of English manufactures are still in vigour; our custom-houses are re-established, and all that is now wanted, is to continue the prohibition. The fears of the petitioners respecting the conclusion of a commercial treaty with England, have appeared to us unfounded. The commercial treaty of 1786, was not signed till three years after the peace of 1783.—This period was necessary to form a correct estimate of the relations between the two nations. After twenty years war, and interruption of all regular commerce, is less time necessary? Besides, a treaty of commerce would not be a reciprocal renunciation of all taxes and prohibitions; it would merely be a new system of prohibition and taxation agreed on by the two sides. It requires therefore time to observe for some time the existing machine, to see what we must destroy, and what we must preserve. Perhaps it would be better to have no commercial treaty, and after renouncing reciprocally those measures which war only could justify, to leave each nation to impose such prohibitions and taxes as its own interest might render advisable.—On the whole, the Committee is inclined to believe that the first demand cannot be taken into consideration; and with respect to the second demand, the absolute prohibition of cotton stuffs, as the laws of the year 2, year 5, and 22d February and 30th April, 1806, which enforce this absolute prohibition, are still in vigour, the Committee is of opinion, that the deliberation on this matter should be adjourned till the new tariff come under your consideration."

#### NATIONAL DEBT.—No. II.

MR. COBBETT.—If I recollect aright my last letter concluded thus:—"Landholders and stockholders offer their lives and fortunes to wage a war, whence the poor derive only additional misery; let the lives and the fortunes, so offered, be the price of their fondness for bloodshed; but the simple peasant, the industrious mechanic, ought not to be the sacrifice.—The rich called for war; let the rich pay

the taxes; or, rather, let their *superfluities* be offered upon the altar of the country, to pay off the National Debt."—Here then, Sir, I take my stand. The population of this country is stated to be about twelve millions of souls—the rich cannot, at the highest calculation, exceed two hundred thousand; and if to these we add those immediately connected with Government, who live upon the produce of the taxes, we may carry their numbers to two millions. Thus, then, two millions live upon the sweat and labour of ten millions of their fellow-creatures. But this is not all; of these ten millions four millions are in the workhouse, and are there in consequence of having been ruined by war and the taxes. Six millions, therefore, of *poor* inhabitants, by hard labour, and incessant industry, maintain, in wretched poverty, four millions of their ruined countrymen; in luxury, two hundred thousand *rich*; and in affluence one million eight hundred thousand dependants on Government, who are employed mostly in looking after and enforcing the payment of these taxes, brought on by the votes, the clamours, and the manœuvres of the fore-mentioned two hundred thousand *rich* lives and fortune men. I shall here but slightly notice, that that *highly respectable* body, the Stock-jobbers, who, some how or other, have acquired great influence, alike on the public purse and upon the public faith, and have, as we lately witnessed, attempted a kind of judicial sovereignty, an *imperium in imperio*, winked at or encouraged (*for reasons best known to themselves*), by his Majesty's Government, these may be included in the two millions. All this were, however, well; or, at least, not to be complained of, if it were free for such as disapprove the measures pursued, such as feel themselves oppressed, to leave the country, and carry their labour and industry with them to a land where they might expect some encouragement, more freedom, and fewer taxes. But laws exist to prevent their removal—Britain is to the industrious artificer a Bajazet's cage, and the tenderness and gratitude of the rich consists in shewing him the loaf, but, at the same time, placing it out of his reach, while, with an ostentatious humanity, inventing and advising substitutes for bread.

The evil pointed out, the remedy is within our reach. To gratify the powerful and the rich, war has been waged, a large National Debt been incurred, a monopoly of land has taken place, and a general



decay of trade has been experienced.—The number of the poor has daily increased;—the necessities of life are now beyond their reach;—luxury, in its march, keeps pace with public misery;—and the groans of the oppressed are drowned in the Bacchanalian noisy mirth of profligacy!—Ten millions suffer, while two millions riot! *Notumas Leges Angliæ mutari.* But these evils proceed not from the laws—the constitutional laws of Great Britain! To that Constitution a National Debt is unknown. To that Constitution a seven years' Parliament is foreign. In that Constitution, Corruption and Ministerial influence are no where mentioned. To that Constitution then let us return.—To pay the National Debt, France sells some of her Crown lands. For a similar purpose, Spain, bigotted Spain, calls upon her Clergy's revenues. Wherefore should England not adopt similar means? These, together with the sale of a part of the pledged, but now monopolized, land, will pay off our National Debt. Our situation will thereby be alleviated; bread will be given to all; industry will acquire a stimulus; our children, no longer born debtors, will cease to be saddled with the wild extravagancies of their forefathers; and Europe, no longer bribed by our gold, will be at peace; while our own lands, subdivided into small farms, will, in every province, carry plenty at reduced prices.—We shall no longer need to fly our paper kite. At least, by shortening its string, there will be less danger of its breaking. It may be a bitter pill to the palate of certain individuals; but it will be a most salutary medicine to the body politic; and where public advantage so preponderates, a refusal, or even hesitation, becomes treason against the nation; for, *Salus Populi prima Lex.*

ARISTIDES.

## PUBLIC REJOICING.

MR. COBBETT.—The delirium of joy, occasioned by the downfall of Bonaparte, exhibited in all the various forms of processions, festivals, illuminations, fireworks, sham fights, and park fairs, has at length subsided; and while resting from the labour and surfeit of rare-shews, we feel something like returning reason, and a disposition to inquire into our present state as a nation—whether it is such as to have warranted those unbounded demonstrations of joy which we have lately witnessed. That there are, in the present state of things, occasion for rejoicing, I am ready to admit. That the blood of mankind

ceases to flow in Europe, is an occasion worthy of our rejoicing; humanity is relieved, and christianity approves the deed. It is consolatory to think, that, in the short interval of peace with France, perhaps a million of lives have already escaped being sacrificed at the shrine of the ambition of contending nations. It is a matter of great joy, that those principles denominated French, and considered as belonging to, and interwoven with, the French Revolution; espoused, as it was said, only by American Republicans, and the factious Whigs of England; so far from being extirpated from the face of the earth, are existing, in full vigour, and that the right of nations to cashier their Governors for mal-administration, is now recognised by the overthrow of Napoleon, and the treaty of Paris, in the presence of the assembled Monarchs of Europe.—It is worthy of our rejoicing, when taking a short retrospect of the last twenty years conflict, that those hostile bands, which conspired against France, and took up arms to blot her from the Map of Europe, were discomfited, their designs frustrated, and their project overthrown: that, while France was free, the united Despots of the world attempted her conquest in vain: when the rights of man and of nations were her motto, and Napoleon her General, she went forth to conquest and to glory. But when France became trained and trammelled, under a military despotism, by Napoleon himself; when, in alliance with powerful potentates, the nature of the contest changed, from freedom and independence, to subjugation and aggrandizement—having no longer justice for its basis, France herself was defeated, and became incapable of even defending her territory. It is worthy of remark, and subject for exultation, that before the Allies entered France, they changed their political creed; proclaimed, in every direction, their determination to support the independence of nations; acknowledged the injustice of interfering in the choice of a Government for France; and recognised the right of every people to model their own Governments as they please. But although these are occasions for rejoicing, they are mixed with circumstances of painful regret. If all the evil, injustice, violence, oppression, and cruelty, had centered in the person of Napoleon, and had been dethroned with him, our joy might have been unbounded; but when we see the same principle of aggrandizement remaining in the world, we fear all the bloodshed and misery Europe



has endured, for these last twenty years, has not been sufficient to work its reformation; and that the evil principles which have been charged on Napoleon exclusively, are adopted by his accusers. What else is the revival of the Slave Trade by a British negotiator? What the transfer of Norway? What the claim of our nation to the Sovereignty of the Ocean, and insisting on searching the vessels of neutrals?—a pretended right which we, in no circumstances, would allow others to exercise on our own vessels. What violence of Napoleon can exceed the mode of predatory warfare we are now carrying on against America?—attacking unarmed inhabitants of defenceless towns, instead of an honourable contest with armed hosts. From such circumstances as these, arising, as I conceive, from a want of just principles, I fear, the nations of Europe, particularly our own, will, ere long, be made to drink deep of the cup of suffering. Yes, the blood of America calls aloud for vengeance on the haughty supporters of corruption, who usurp the title of deity, and proclaim themselves the Sovereigns of the sea—an element made, like the air we breathe, and the earth we tread on, for the benefit and blessing of mankind. When reading the severe remonstrances of the merchants of Liverpool, for the loss of their vessels, and their declaration that their ports are in a state of blockade, I cannot help involuntarily exclaiming: 'How now, Sovereigns of the sea! the judgment of Heaven appears to be coming upon you. Already, those whom you attacked, because they were weak and unprepared for war, are driven to make a dreadful retaliation; so sad in its effects as to lead the mercantile interest from the Minister to the Throne, notwithstanding all the efforts of Ministerial influence at Liverpool to prevent such a course.'—Yes, the seizure of vessels, and taking out seamen, under the pretence of their being British born, who had no possibility of proving their birth, appears to me so unjust, that all the raree-shows in St. James's, could not efface the melancholy impression from my mind of the humiliation we should, one day, suffer from such unrighteous proceedings. Yet, I did not expect to hear so soon our own ports declared in a state of blockade, or such early complaints of an unprotected trade, and of seamen dragged into captivity. When I read the hireling prints of the day, raving at Mr. Madison, I thought their falsehoods unworthy of notice; but, through your

medium, I would remind my countrymen, that no pretence they have set up for attacking America, in the least exists. No Tyrant; no Despot is there. No conqueror of Europe, or gigantic power, terrific in its magnitude, or terrible in its effects. No counterpart of the Tyrant of France, as he was called, violating the rights of men and nations. No, all this is worse than pretence. The blaze of illuminations, or the dissipation of long continued festivities, cannot conceal it from a public now become sober, and capable of reflection. The President of America rules according to well regulated laws, and a wise Constitution; consulting on all occasions that legitimate organ of the people—the Congress. Judging from the language of our corrupt Press, so far from attacking America on these accounts, I am led to suspect, that the love of freedom and independence on the part of the Americans, is the grievance which excites our hatred, our malice, and our revenge; but the effects of which, alas! seems fast recoiling on our own heads. In comparing the events interwoven with, and which are the result of the late Peace, we must be deeply afflicted with the restoration of the Papal Hierarchy, the Inquisition, and the Order of the Jesuits—Powers that, we know, have committed ten thousand times more cruelties than the deposed Napoleon. Our No Popery heroes, fearing to give an independent Catholic Church equal rights; looking on these events with complacency; warrant the conclusion that they have a love for the worst of all despotisms—Ecclesiastical domination, which Britain, in her better days, shed her blood to destroy. From these considerations, I am led to conclude, that either more just principles, and more honest politics must speedily be resorted to, or our doom is sealed, and judgment at the door. H. F.

#### THE RECKONING.

You are right, you are right, Mr. Cobbett, when you say, that "unluckily for the cause of peace, all the numerous and powerful class, who deserve their support from the land, whether as landlords, tenants, or by the owners, begin to cry out against the effects of peace, and with them the American war was better than no war at all."—I am happy to see that you have taken the subject of the Corn Bill into discussion, and shall peruse your remarks with pleasure. Your statement as to the import of French cattle astounds me; however I heartily rejoice



decay of trade has been experienced.—The number of the poor has daily increased;—the necessities of life are now beyond their reach;—luxury, in its march, keeps pace with public misery;—and the groans of the oppressed are drowned in the Bacchanalian noisy mirth of profligacy!—Ten millions suffer, while two millions riot! *Notumas Leges Angliæ mutari.* But these evils proceed not from the laws—the constitutional laws of Great Britain! To that Constitution a National Debt is unknown. To that Constitution a seven years' Parliament is foreign. In that Constitution, Corruption and Ministerial influence are no where mentioned. To that Constitution then let us return.—To pay the National Debt, France sells some of her Crown lands. For a similar purpose, Spain, bigotted Spain, calls upon her Clergy's revenues. Wherefore should England not adopt similar means? These, together with the sale of a part of the pledged, but now monopolized, land, will pay off our National Debt. Our situation will thereby be alleviated; bread will be given to all; industry will acquire a stimulus; our children, no longer born debtors, will cease to be saddled with the wild extravagancies of their forefathers; and Europe, no longer bribed by our gold, will be at peace; while our own lands, subdivided into small farms, will, in every province, carry plenty at reduced prices.—We shall no longer need to fly our paper kite. At least, by shortening its string, there will be less danger of its breaking. It may be a bitter pill to the palate of certain individuals; but it will be a most salutary medicine to the body politic; and where public advantage so preponderates, a refusal, or even hesitation, becomes treason against the nation; for, *Salus Populi prima Lex.*

ARISTIDES.

## PUBLIC REJOICING.

MR. COBBETT.—The delirium of joy, occasioned by the downfall of Bonaparte, exhibited in all the various forms of processions, festivals, illuminations, fireworks, sham fights, and park fairs, has at length subsided; and while resting from the labour and surfeit of rare-shows, we feel something like returning reason, and a disposition to inquire into our present state as a nation—whether it is such as to have warranted those unbounded demonstrations of joy which we have lately witnessed. That there are, in the present state of things, occasion for rejoicing, I am ready to admit. That the blood of mankind

ceases to flow in Europe, is an occasion worthy of our rejoicing; humanity is relieved, and christianity approves the deed. It is consolatory to think, that, in the short interval of peace with France, perhaps a million of lives have already escaped being sacrificed at the shrine of the ambition of contending nations. It is a matter of great joy, that those principles denominated French, and considered as belonging to, and interwoven with, the French Revolution; espoused, as it was said, only by American Republicans, and the factious Whigs of England; so far from being extirpated from the face of the earth, are existing, in full vigour, and that the right of nations to cashier their Governors for mal-administration, is now recognised by the overthrow of Napoleon, and the treaty of Paris, in the presence of the assembled Monarchs of Europe.—It is worthy of our rejoicing, when taking a short retrospect of the last twenty years conflict, that those hostile bands, which conspired against France, and took up arms to blot her from the Map of Europe, were discomfited, their designs frustrated, and their project overthrown: that, while France was free, the united Despots of the world attempted her conquest in vain: when the rights of man and of nations were her motto, and Napoleon her General, she went forth to conquest and to glory. But when France became trained and trammelled, under a military despotism, by Napoleon himself; when, in alliance with powerful potentates, the nature of the contest changed, from freedom and independence, to subjugation and aggrandizement—having no longer justice for its basis, France herself was defeated, and became incapable of even defending her territory. It is worthy of remark, and subject for exultation, that before the Allies entered France, they changed their political creed; proclaimed, in every direction, their determination to support the independence of nations; acknowledged the injustice of interfering in the choice of a Government for France; and recognised the right of every people to model their own Governments as they please. But although these are occasions for rejoicing, they are mixed with circumstances of painful regret. If all the evil, injustice, violence, oppression, and cruelty, had centered in the person of Napoleon, and had been dethroned with him, our joy might have been unbounded; but when we see the same principle of aggrandizement remaining in the world, we fear all the bloodshed and misery Europe



has endured, for these last twenty years, has not been sufficient to work its reformation; and that the evil principles which have been charged on Napoleon exclusively, are adopted by his accusers. What else is the revival of the Slave Trade by a British negociator? What the transfer of Norway? What the claim of our nation to the Sovereignty of the Ocean, and insisting on searching the vessels of neutrals?—a pretended right which we, in no circumstances, would allow others to exercise on our own vessels. What violence of Napoleon can exceed the mode of predatory warfare we are now carrying on against America?—attacking unarmed inhabitants of defenceless towns, instead of an honourable contest with armed hosts. From such circumstances as these, arising, as I conceive, from a want of just principles, I fear, the nations of Europe, particularly our own, will, ere long, be made to drink deep of the cup of suffering. Yes, the blood of America calls aloud for vengeance on the haughty supporters of corruption, who usurp the title of deity, and proclaim themselves the Sovereigns of the sea—an element made, like the air we breathe, and the earth we tread on, for the benefit and blessing of mankind. When reading the severe remonstrances of the merchants of Liverpool, for the loss of their vessels, and their declaration that their ports are in a state of blockade, I cannot help involuntarily exclaiming 'How now, Sovereigns of the sea! the judgment of Heaven appears to be coming upon you. Already, those whom you attacked, because they were weak and unprepared for war, are driven to make a dreadful retaliation; so sad in its effects as to lead the mercantile interest from the Minister to the Throne, notwithstanding all the efforts of Ministerial influence at Liverpool to prevent such a course.'—Yes, the seizure of vessels, and taking out seamen, under the pretence of their being British born, who had no possibility of proving their birth, appears to me so unjust, that all the rance-shows in St. James's, could not efface the melancholy impression from my mind of the humiliation we should, one day, suffer from such unrighteous proceedings. Yet, I did not expect to hear so soon our own ports declared in a state of blockade, or such early complaints of an unprotected trade, and of seamen dragged into captivity. When I read the hireling prints of the day, raving at Mr. Madison, I thought their falsehoods unworthy of notice; but, through your

medium, I would remind my countrymen, that no pretence they have set up for attacking America, in the least exists. No Tyrant; no Despot is there. No conqueror of Europe, or gigantic power, terrific in its magnitude, or terrible in its effects. No counterpart of the Tyrant of France, as he was called, violating the rights of men and nations. No, all this is worse than pretence. The blaze of illuminations, or the dissipation of long continued festivities, cannot conceal it from a public now become sober, and capable of reflection. The President of America rules according to well regulated laws, and a wise Constitution; consulting on all occasions that legitimate organ of the people—the Congress. Judging from the language of our corrupt Press, so far from attacking America on these accounts, I am led to suspect, that the love of freedom and independence on the part of the Americans, is the grievance which excites our hatred, our malice, and our revenge; but the effects of which, alas! seems fast recoiling on our own heads. In comparing the events interwoven with, and which are the result of the late Peace, we must be deeply afflicted with the restoration of the Papal Hierarchy, the Inquisition, and the Order of the Jesuits—Powers that, we know, have committed ten thousand times more cruelties than the deposed Napoleon. Our No Popery heroes, fearing to give an independent Catholic Church equal rights; looking on these events with complacency; warrant the conclusion that they have a love for the worst of all despotisms—Ecclesiastical domination, which Britain, in her better days, shed her blood to destroy. From these considerations, I am led to conclude, that either more just principles, and more honest politics must speedily be resorted to, or our doom is sealed, and judgment at the door. R. F.

#### THE RECKONING.

You are right, you are right, Mr. Cobbett, when you say, that "unluckily for the cause of peace, all the numerous and powerful class, who deserve their support from the land, whether as landlords, tenants, or by the owners, begin to cry out against the effects of peace, and with them the American war was better than no war at all."—I am happy to see that you have taken the subject of the Corn Bill into discussion, and shall peruse your remarks with pleasure. Your statement as to the import of French cattle astounds me; however I heartily rejoice



at the event, and could wish it encouraged to the fullest extent, as one of the surest means of convincing the deluded people of this country, that peace is more profitable than war; that whilst we have war, we must pay taxes, and whilst we have taxes we must, in spite of profound logic, pay dear for bread and every other necessary of life.—There is one thing, Sir, that I view very seriously, and which I could wish you to discuss, viz. The considerable emigration of our war advocates, and others, who are not content to feed on our flesh, but must take the most destructive means of sucking our hearts blood.—Now, Sir, I could wish you to call for the reckoning, and to point out to the partakers of the feast, the injustice of their departing, *before they pay the bill*; if not the reckoning will fall most intolerable on the honourable and peaceable part of the community, who, we shall suppose, have no just right to pay one atom, as not acceding to or partaking of the spoil. Indeed, no one should be allowed to quit the country who receive their support from the public purse.—Those who are neither placemen nor pensioners, but the true friends of liberty and peace, I would exonerate from any part of the reckoning, because they are unwilling instruments of destruction, and necessitated, by the glittering sword of despotism, to be tame spectators of the infamy.—They are, by the law of Nature, entitled to roam any where and every where.

A REFORMER.

*Sloane-street, Chelsea, Sept. 24, 1814.*

DESTRUCTION OF WASHINGTON.—The *Courier* of yesterday says, “there were reports last night of our having attacked and taken New London, and destroyed the city of Baltimore.” The work of destruction, therefore, it would appear from this, is to be persisted in during the continuance of the war with America. The following article, extracted from the *Paris Papers*, will shew what opinion the people of France entertain of this predatory mode of warfare:—

“PARIS, 1st OCTOBER.—It is assuredly not without the most painful feelings that our readers have perused the details we have given them, respecting the capture and destruction of the capital of the United States of America. Thus, then, the war is prosecuted in the New World with the same character of fury as for so long a period spread desolation over the Old. It there exhibits the same spectacle of devastation and horror,

at the moment when we flattered ourselves with the prospect of beholding the revival, even in the midst of battles, of those principles of humanity and the law of nations, which a polished and civilized people ought never to violate. Was it intended to furnish him with an excuse, who was justly accused of trampling under foot all those principles, by imitating his barbarous example? What! the English who reproached him with such force and justice, with spreading pillage and conflagration wherever he went, with ruining and destroying the towns that submitted to his armies, now make themselves masters of Washington, plunder and lay it waste, blow up all its public establishments and principal edifices, and carry off in their ships all that they do not chuse to destroy by fire and sword! It is not an absolutely foreign city to which we lie, none of those ancient relations which doubly claim the rights of humanity ought to insure a less severe fate, that they have thus treated; it is a city, which may be called English, which speaks the same language, which has the same manners, and composed of inhabitants whose fathers were English! How much was it to be wished, that hostilities had ceased in America, as in Europe, on the fall of him who had given the signal for them in all parts of the world!—Why, at least, has not war itself experienced the good effects of that fall? Why is it conducted in the manner of pirates, who land upon a coast to ravage it, and then precipitately embark again, not feeling themselves sufficiently strong to occupy it and maintain their position? Was it not in this manner that the English landed to the number of five thousand, as it is said, at Washington, and then fled, after having ruined, and, as it were, swept from the face of the earth one of the finest capitals in the world, which most forcibly struck by its magnificence and establishments, one of the most celebrated travellers of the present day, M. de Humboldt? Is it thus that the hero whom they hold forth with just pride to the admiration of Europe, made war in Portugal, in Spain, in France?—The English have often preached up excellent principles of morals and humanity; they have often and justly reproached their enemies with violating those principles; but let them beware—their edifying sermons and their severe reproaches will lose much of their force, if they themselves commit those excesses of which they accuse others. Their enemies assert, that it is rather their own interest than that of humanity which in general governs their morality and their conduct; that at this moment, for instance, when they are so zealously pleading the cause of the Negroes, it is less out of love for the Africans than from jealousy of the French colonies:—we indeed believe no such thing; but we must confess that frequent examples, such as that which they have just exhibited at Washington, would grievously embarrass their friends.”